

# **The Illinois Statewide January 2004 DUI Enforcement Campaign Survey**

*Conducted for*



**Illinois Department  
of Transportation**

*Conducted by*



**Survey Research Office  
Center for State Policy and Leadership  
University of Illinois at Springfield**

## **Summary Report**

Field Interviewing: January 5-20, 2004

Report: March 10, 2004

*Written by*

Richard Schuldt, Director, UIS/SRO of CSPL

*With assistance from*

Mark Winland, Research Assistant

Kelly Best, Graduate Assistant

## **Introduction**

In the Fall of 2003, the Illinois Department of Transportation contracted with the Survey Research Office, located in the Center for State Policy and Leadership, at the University of Illinois at Springfield to conduct a telephone survey regarding DUI-related opinions and behaviors in January, 2004.<sup>1</sup> The survey followed a DUI enforcement campaign that took place during the end-of-year holiday season of 2003.

Earlier in 2003, two separate surveys were conducted before and after a major DUI initiative that involved both media and enforcement-related activities that occurred during a time period surrounding the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday, 2003. [Interviewing for this “pre-test” (before) survey was conducted from June 3 to 18, 2003, and interviewing for the “post-test” (after) survey was conducted from July 14 to August 5, 2003.] In a sense, these surveys – particularly the survey

---

<sup>1</sup> The Center was previously the Institute for Public Affairs (1990-2002) and then the Lincoln Center for Governmental Studies (2002-2003), all located at the University of Illinois at Springfield.

after the July 4<sup>th</sup> campaign – serve as a “pre-test” for the most recent January 2004 survey.<sup>2</sup> Field interviewing for the most recent survey occurred from January 5 through January 20, 2004.

## Methodology

The sampling methodology for the recent survey was similar to that of the earlier 2003 surveys. The state was first stratified into the Chicago metro area and the remaining Illinois counties, known as “downstate.” The Chicago metro area was further stratified into the City of Chicago and the Chicago area suburbs, which included the Cook County suburbs and the suburbs in the five “collar” counties. The downstate area was further subdivided into north/central Illinois and southern Illinois. Thus, the statewide surveys had four stratified geographic regions: City of Chicago, Chicago suburban counties, and the downstate counties, subdivided into north/central Illinois and southern Illinois. Random samples of telephone numbers were purchased for each of the four stratification areas (City of Chicago, Chicago suburban counties, north/central Illinois, and southern Illinois).

Each telephone number in the samples was called a maximum of six times, at differing times of the week and day. Within households, interviewers asked for the youngest licensed driver 75 percent of the time, because earlier experience showed that we under-represent younger drivers. In the other 25 percent of the time, interviewers asked for a licensed driver who was male/female (varying at random) and who had the next birthday. Replacements were accepted if that designated household member was not available. The average length of completed interviews was just under 15 minutes (median = 14 mins.; mean = 14.7 mins.).

Altogether, 825 respondents were interviewed for the January survey.<sup>3</sup> By stratification group, they are distributed as follows. Comparisons with the two earlier surveys are also presented.

	2003 Pre-Test <u>June 2003</u>	2003 Post-Test <u>July 2003</u>	January <u>2004</u>
<i>TOTAL</i>	623	869	825
City of Chicago	160	228	218
Chicago suburban counties	177	288	261
Downstate counties	286	353	332
<i>North/central Illinois</i>	166	181	166
<i>Southern Illinois</i>	120	172	166

The sampling error for the January statewide results is +/- 3.5 percent (at the 95<sup>th</sup> confidence level). Respective sampling errors for the two earlier surveys are: the June 2003 Pre-test Survey

<sup>2</sup> The reality was even a bit more complex here. There was also a seat belt campaign that took place around the Memorial Day weekend in 2003. The June 2003 survey served as a “post-test” for seat belt-related questions (as well as the “pre-test” for the DUI campaign), and an earlier May 2003 survey served as a “pre-test” for these seat belt questions. The January 2004 survey also included these seat belt questions. Results for the seat belt questions are presented in a separate report.

<sup>3</sup> There was some attrition during the interviewing, with the result that 777 full completions were obtained for the January 2004 survey. These full completions numbers are 576 for the June 2003 Pre-test survey and 842 for the July 2003 Post-test survey. The sampling errors presented are based on the average between partial and full completion numbers.

(+/- 4.0%); and the July 2003 Post-test Survey (+/- 3.4%). The error for subgroups in all surveys is, of course, larger.

In the following summary, the statewide results for both surveys have been weighted to arrive at a proper distribution by region and by gender. No other weighting has been applied.<sup>4</sup>

## RESULTS

In the results that follow, we focus on those questions most pertinent to the alcohol-impaired driving initiative, and we focus on the statewide results, specifically highlighting the changes that occurred from the earlier surveys in 2003 (particularly the July 2003 “post-test” survey) to the most recent January 2004 survey. We also describe the results for those statewide respondents who reported having had an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days.<sup>5</sup> Results by region are commented upon where appropriate. Further, we examined the results by the demographic characteristics of gender, age (three groupings), and race (white/non-white) and by the frequency of reported alcohol beverage drinking. These full results are presented in the accompanying **Alcohol-Impaired Driving Initiative Tables** compiled for the project. Changes incorporated into these tables are those from July 2003 to January 2004. In the following summary report, percentages have been rounded to integers.<sup>6</sup>

***Demographic characteristics of the samples.*** Before reporting the alcohol-related results, it is worth noting that the weighted statewide samples are similar on selected demographic characteristics. Of course, the three samples have been weighted to be virtually equal on region and gender. A look at the three samples on the characteristics of education level, nature of local area, and race/ethnicity shows a basic similarity. The latter two surveys, July 2003 and January 2004, show somewhat fewer respondents less than 30 and somewhat more in the age range of 30 to 49 than does the June 2003 survey.

It is also worth noting that the reported frequency of alcoholic beverage drinking of the three samples is similar. While somewhat fewer January 2004 respondents reported not having a drink in the past 30 days than was the case in June and July of 2003 (39% vs. 44%), the increase is predominantly found in those who reported drinking only on celebrations or on special occasions (24% vs. 18-20%), a finding that is not surprising given that the January survey was taken immediately after the holiday season.

---

<sup>4</sup> Despite the fact that the interviewer asks to speak to the youngest licensed driver three-quarters of the time, it appears the survey still under-represents the youngest drivers. In addition, it appears the survey somewhat over-represents licensed drivers with at least a four-year college education and under-represents those with at most a high school education. Neither has been corrected for in these results, but there is a great deal of consistency in the distributions across the three surveys (particularly for education). Thus, trends/changes across the three surveys generally cannot be attributable to changes in these characteristics.

<sup>5</sup> The national survey template called for initial questions about drinking behavior, and the full survey to be given only to those who had an alcoholic beverage in the past three months. However, since we also wanted to assess awareness of the new seatbelt laws in the July survey – and we also focused on seat belt-related opinions and behaviors in the January 2004 survey, we did not limit the instrument to those who had a drink in the past three months. Furthermore, this allowed us to move the drinking behavior questions toward the end of the interview, just prior to the demographics, a place more appropriate for such questions in our opinion. For this reason, we also increased the actual sample size in both surveys.

<sup>6</sup> When the decimal is .5, we round to the even integer.

## Behaviors relating to drinking and driving

**Frequency of drinking.** *“How often did you drink alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days?”* Statewide, very few January respondents report drinking every day while 13 percent report drinking *at least* several days a week. About one-fifth (20%) report drinking either “once a week or less” or “only on weekends,” about one-quarter (24%) report drinking only on celebrations or special occasions, and nearly four of ten (39%) report not having had a drink the past thirty days. As noted above, the results depart from the earlier 2003 survey results in the somewhat greater percent who indicated drinking only on special occasions and the somewhat lower percent who reported not having had a drink in the past thirty days.

*For those who have had an alcoholic drink in the past thirty days*, the June to July differences show small decreases at both ends of the frequencies with an accompanying increase in those who drink once a week (or less) or only on weekends. The July to January differences show declines in the percent who drink “once a week or less” or “only on weekends” and an accompanying increase in those who drink only *on celebrations or special occasions*.

The January 2004 results show that about one in six respondents in the two Chicago area regions (16% in each) reported drinking *at least* several times a week, compared to about half this number in north/central Illinois (8%) and even fewer in southern Illinois (5%). This most recent result is a small increase from previous surveys for the City of Chicago (11%, 13%, and 16%). The results here for the Chicago suburbs are generally quite stable (15%, 12%, and 16%). For north/central Illinois, the January and July results are lower than the June percent (14%, then to 8% and 8%). And, for southern Illinois, the latest finding is about half that found in the June and July surveys (11%, 12%, and then 5%).

Consistent with what was said above, every region shows an increase in January for those who indicated drinking “only on celebrations or special occasions.” However, only in the City of Chicago is this accompanied by a sizeable decrease from July to January in those who reported never having had a drink in the past thirty days (46% to 37%). These percentages are very similar in the other three regions (about 37%-38% for the Chicago suburbs; 50%-52% for north/central Illinois; and 47%-48% for southern Illinois).

**Drinking and driving.** *“Have you ever driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking alcoholic beverages?” [For the approximate 54 to 58 percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* In all three surveys, about three of ten respondents who had drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days reported having driven a motor vehicle within two hours after drinking.

The only region that shows a sizeable change across the three surveys is north/central Illinois, where the proportion that indicated they had done such increased from 29 percent in June to 36 and 37 percent in July and January, respectively. These percentage ranges for the other three regions are: the City of Chicago (28%-29%); the Chicago suburbs (26%-29%); and southern Illinois (30%-33%). [However, it should be noted the numbers for some of these regional results drop below 100, particularly for the June survey and particularly for the two regions in downstate Illinois.]

**Number of times.** *“About how many times in the past thirty days did you drive within two hours after drinking?” [For the three of ten respondents who indicated they had done so.]* Very similar proportions of respondents who had driven within two hours of drinking – somewhat more than one-third in each survey (36%-37%) -- reported they had done so only once. More July (post-test) and January 2004 than June respondents reported

having done so twice (37% and 33% vs. 22%) while twice as many June and January respondents than July respondents reported having done so three or four times (28% and 25% vs. 13%). Greater proportions of these respondents reported having done this five or more times in June and July than said so in January (13%-14% vs. 6%). [It should be noted here that the June results are based on somewhat fewer than 100 respondents while the July and January results are based on 142 and 121 respondents.]

**Number of drinks on last occasion.** *“On the most recent occasion (driving within two hours of drinking), about how many drinks did you have?” [For the three of ten respondents who indicated they had driven within two hours of drinking.]* In the January 2004 survey, about 30 percent indicated having had one drink, nearly as many said two drinks (28%), and only slightly fewer said three or four drinks (27%). About 15 percent reported have had five or more drinks. Compared to the June and July results, fewer January respondents reported having had one or two drinks while more reported having had five or more drinks.

**Frequency drive when too much to drink.** *“About how many times in the past thirty days did you drive when you thought you had too much to drink?” [For the approximate 54 to 58 percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* Across all three surveys, about 95 percent of those asked the question (those who drank in the past thirty days) reported never having had too much to drink when they drove in the past thirty days while 3 to 4 percent reported they had.

Reports of *never* having done so in the past thirty days are slightly more frequent in the Chicago area (98% for the City of Chicago, 95% for the suburbs) than for the two downstate regions (93%).

**Assessed trend in personal drinking and driving.** *“Compared to three months ago, are you now driving after drinking: more often, less often, or about the same?” [For the approximate 54 to 58 percent who indicated they drank alcoholic beverages in the past thirty days.]* The results across the three surveys are also very similar here for those who were asked the question (those who drank in the past thirty days).

About one in ten (9%-11%) said they drive after drinking “less often,” over one-quarter reported doing so “about the same” (27%-30%), and about six of ten (57-60%) reported they never drive after drinking. Hardly any reported doing so “more often” (less than 2%).

Results in the Chicago area’s two regions are quite stable across the three surveys and come close to the statewide results reported above. For north/central Illinois, the largest changes from the earlier surveys to January are the fewer respondents who reported not having driving after drinking (61-62% to 49%), and the greater number of respondents who reported driving after drinking “about the same” (21-23% to 39%). For southern Illinois, there was an increase from June to July and January in the percent who reported never driving after drinking (45% to 58% and 53%).

## **Perceptions of and attitudes about police presence and enforcement**

**Perceptions of DUI enforcement.** Three questions in the interview solicited respondents’ perceptions about general police presence on roads and police enforcement of DUI laws. In the first question, respondents were asked how likely it is they would be stopped if they

drove after having too much to drink. In the second question, respondents were asked about the relative frequency they see police on the roads they drive (compared to three months ago). And, in the third question, respondents were asked another relative question, this time being how likely it is that a driver who had been drinking will be stopped, compared to three months ago<sup>7</sup> (Also see the next section for questions specifically relating to roadside checks.)

**Police enforcement of drinking laws -- a hypothetical, personalized-wording question.** *“If you drove after having too much to drink to drive safely, how likely do you think you are to be stopped by a police officer?”* For the results of this question, we will focus on the results for those respondents who gave a substantive answer to the question.<sup>8</sup>

Of these respondents statewide, about one-tenth or somewhat less picked each of the most extreme categories: *almost certain* (10%), and *very unlikely* (8%). About twice as many picked each of the next categories: *very likely* (22%), and *somewhat unlikely* (20%). And twice as many picked the middle category of *somewhat likely* (40%). This result does not depart much at all from the July 2003 results. But, the percent who chose either “almost certain” or “very likely” to be stopped is about 10 percentage points lower in these surveys than was the case in June 2003.

In January 2004, the statewide results are, overall, quite similar for all those who gave a substantive answer and for those respondents who have had an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days. Across all survey years, however, those who have had an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days have somewhat lower percentages who say they are either “almost certain” or “very likely” to be stopped than is the case for all respondents (34% vs. 40% in June; 24% vs. 30% in July; and 26% vs. 32% in January). On the other hand, there is not much difference at all in the percent who chose “very unlikely” to be stopped.

*For City of Chicago respondents*, the percent who believe it is either “almost certain” or “very likely” shows a small decline from the June to the July and January surveys (37% to 33% and 32%), while the percent who believe it is either “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” increased from June to July and January (29% to 39% and 37%).

*For Chicago suburban respondents*, the percent who believe it is either “almost certain” or “very likely” also shows a decline from the June to the July and January surveys (45% to 30% and 33%), while the percent who believe it is either “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” is basically stable across the three surveys (28%, 30%, and 27%). Here, the percent who said “somewhat likely” increased from June to July and January (28% to 40% and 41%).

*For north/central Illinois respondents*, the percent who believe it is either “almost certain” or “very likely” also shows a decline from the June to the July and January surveys (39% to 29% and 32%). Here, small increases are found both for those who believe it is either “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” (21% to 26% and 25%) and for those who believe it is “somewhat likely” (40% to 45% and 42%).

*For southern Illinois respondents*, the percent who believe it is either “almost certain” or “very likely” is generally stable across the three surveys (28%, 29%, and 27%). Here, the increase is found for those who believe they are “somewhat likely” to be stopped (41% to 44% to

---

<sup>7</sup> Because of possible question order effects here, we kept the order of these questions the same as in the national survey template.

<sup>8</sup> Across the three surveys, 2% to 5% said “don’t know” or refused to answer. However, about twice as many in the July post-test survey as in the June pre-test survey or the January 2004 survey were coded as not relating to the question (26% vs. 14% and 12%). For future surveys of this sort, it might be better not to personalize the question. That is, instead of asking, “if you drove after having too much to drink ...,” it might be better to ask respondents how likely police are to stop drivers who do this behavior. This is in line with the wording of the third question in this section.

54%). And, the decline is found for those who believe it is either “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” (31% to 27% to 19%).

**Police presence on roads.** *“ Compared with three months ago, do you see police on the roads you normally drive more often, less often, or about the same?”* The proportion of statewide respondents who indicated police presence as “more” dropped from over three in ten (32%) to less than one-quarter (23%) from June to July, a drop of almost 9 percentage points, and then remained at that level in January (21%). The accompanying increase is seen in the proportion of those who said “about the same” (62% to 71% and 73%).

The results are quite similar for those respondents who reported having had an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days. Across all surveys, we find a slight tendency for those who have had a drink to be less likely to say “more often” and more likely to say “about the same.”

This trend of decreasing proportions saying they see police “more” on the roads they normally drive is found in three of the four regions: Chicago suburbs (31% to 24% to 19%); north/central Illinois (36% to 24% to 19%); and southern Illinois (37% to 21% to 17%). For the City of Chicago, the June 2003 and January 2004 percentages who say “more” are greater than the July percentage (25% to 20% to 27%).

**Police enforcement of drinking laws -- comparative, general evaluation.** *“ Compared to three months ago, do you think a driver who had been drinking is now more likely to be stopped by police, less likely to be stopped, or is this about the same?”* Statewide, the results are very similar across the three surveys. In each case, about three in ten (32%, 33%, and 28%) said “more likely” while about six in ten (60%, 57%, and 62%) said “about the same.”

However, *for those respondents who have had a drink within the past thirty days*, the responses are more similar between the June and January surveys, with the July result being different. For instance, the proportion who said “more likely to be stopped” is about one-quarter in June and January but lower in July (25% to 32% to 23%) while the proportion who said “about the same” shows a reverse pattern (68% to 60% to 70%).

The greatest changes here are seen in southern Illinois, where there are consecutive decreases in the percentage saying “more likely to be stopped” (39% to 31% to 27%) and accompanying increases saying “about the same” (50% to 60% to 66%). This same pattern is much more subtle in the City of Chicago, with the increase in the percentage saying “about the same” (53% to 56% to 63%) coming “at the expense” of both the percent who say “more likely” (34% to 34% to 27%) and the percent who indicated they do not know (10% to 9% to 5%).

In north/central Illinois, the July results show a small increase in the percent who said “more likely,” but the January result is very similar to the June level (32% to 36% to 30%). The results in the Chicago suburbs are very similar across the three surveys, with about three in ten saying they are “more likely” to be stopped (28% to 31% to 28%).

## **Evaluations of penalties given to DUI offenders**

Two questions in the interview solicited respondents’ evaluations of the penalties given to DUI offenders. One dealt with first offenders, and the other dealt with repeat offenders. These were asked for the first time in the January 2004 survey.

**Evaluations of penalties for first offenders.** *“Do you think the penalties given to drivers your area who are guilty of their first offense for alcohol-impaired driving are: too*

***lenient, too harsh, or about right?***” A plurality of 45 percent of the statewide respondents reported the penalties for first offenders are “about right” while about three in ten (31%) said they are “too lenient” and only about one in twenty (4%) said “too harsh.” About one in five (20%) did not express an opinion.

The results for those who have had a drink in the past thirty days are quite similar, with only slightly more of this group saying the penalties are “about right” (49%) and slightly fewer saying they are “too lenient” (28%).

In all four regions, a majority or plurality believe that the penalties for first time offenders are “about right.” However, respondents in the two downstate regions are more likely to say this than those in the two Chicago area regions (48%-54% vs. 40%-42%), while those in the two Chicago area regions are more likely to say these penalties are “too lenient” (31%-35% vs. 25%-26%).

**Evaluations of penalties for repeat offenders.** ***“Do you think the penalties given to repeat offenders of alcohol-impaired driving are: too lenient, too harsh, or about right?”*** For this question about repeat offenders, a majority (51%) said the penalties are “too lenient” while about one-quarter (26%) said “about right” and hardly any (2%) said “too harsh.” Again, about one in five (21%) did not express an opinion.

The results for those who have had a drink in the past thirty days are very similar to these results.

A majority of respondents in the Chicago suburbs (57%) believe that the penalties for repeat offenders are “too lenient” while a plurality of nearly one-half do so in north/central Illinois (48%) and the City of Chicago (47%). A plurality of just over four in ten do so in southern Illinois (42%).

## **Roadside safety checks**

Respondents were asked about their awareness and experience with roadside safety checks in general. Later in the survey instrument, they were asked about their awareness and experience with safety checks whose primary purpose was to check for alcohol-impaired driving.

It should be noted that this departs a bit from the national survey template. This was done intentionally for reasons of obtaining comparable Illinois trend data and because Illinois roadside checks are somewhat different than those in many other states.<sup>9</sup>

In interpreting change, here, it should also be noted that there was a sizeable increase from *May 2003* to *June 2003* in the percent who had seen/heard about roadchecks in the past thirty days (16% in May to 40% in June).<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> In terms of obtaining comparable data, we had asked the general roadside check question for the past several surveys. The wording itself is a bit different from the national template because of the nature of Illinois roadchecks, checking vehicles which pass through a roadcheck for all possible traffic violations. To make the Illinois data comparable, we added a later question which asked about road safety checks which appeared to be primarily targeted for alcohol-impaired driving. We believe these questions reflect the actual situation in Illinois while also giving us comparable data.

<sup>10</sup> The May 2003 survey was the “pre-test” survey for the Memorial Day seat belt initiative. For these results, see the January 2004 Seat Belt Initiative Report and accompanying tables.



## ***General roadside safety-check questions***

***Awareness of roadside safety checks.*** The percent who indicated that, “*in the past thirty days,*” they had “*seen or heard of anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks where they stop to check drivers and vehicles*” stayed very stable, at nearly 40 percent in both the June and July surveys (40% and 38%) and then increased to almost one-half (48%) in the January survey.<sup>11</sup> The results are about the same for those respondents who indicated drinking alcohol in the past thirty days.

The January 2004 survey results show increases in awareness for three of the four regions: City of Chicago (37% and 33% to 48%); Chicago suburbs (35% and 36% to 43%); and north/central Illinois (47% and 44% to 54%). The results are more stable in southern Illinois, but still show an increase from July to January (48%, 43%, and 49%).

*Of those who had seen or heard anything about roadside safety checks,* the statewide percent who indicated they had personally seen such checks shows small and consecutive increases across the three surveys (29% to 34% to 37%).<sup>12</sup> The results for those who indicated drinking alcohol in the past thirty days are quite similar, except that the July and January results are basically the same (33% and then 34%).

This increase is sizeable and consecutive in the City of Chicago (23% to 31% to 40%). It is also sizeable in north/central Illinois, with most of it occurring between June and July (21% to 33% to 36%). Awareness is far more stable in both the Chicago suburbs (range of 37%-39%) and in southern Illinois (range of 31%-33%).

*When these results are based on all sample members* (and not just those aware), we find the percent who have seen a roadside safety check increased only slightly from June to July (11% to 13%) and then increased to 18 percent in January. The same is the case for those who reported drinking alcohol in the past thirty days.

Sizeable increases in this percentage are found in both the City of Chicago (8% and 10% to 19%) and in north/central Illinois (10% to 15% to 19%). Again, the results are far more stable in both the Chicago suburbs (14%, 13%, and 16%) and southern Illinois (16%, 13%, and 16%).

When *those who had personally seen a roadside check*, were asked whether they have “*personally been through a roadside check in the past thirty days, either as a driver or as a passenger,*” the June and July results are very similar, at just over 40 percent (41% for each), and then this increased to 46 percent in January. Calculated on the basis of all sample members, this translates into about one in twenty who have been through a roadside check in the past thirty days in both June and July (about 5%) and 8 percent in January.

For those who indicated drinking in the past thirty days and who had seen a safety check, the percent who indicated actually having gone through a check declined somewhat from the two 2003 surveys to the January 2004 survey (40%-41% vs. 34%). But, of all sample members who had indicated drinking in the past thirty days, the total percent who indicated having gone through a safety check remains at about one in twenty across all three surveys.

When the percentage of *all sample members* who indicated having gone through a safety check in the past thirty days is examined in each region, we find general stability in the Chicago suburbs (4%-6%) and in southern Illinois (6%-7%). However, we find increases in this

---

<sup>11</sup> For awareness of roadside safety checks, we used the final percentages after a follow-up question that confirmed the meaning of “roadside safety checks.”

<sup>12</sup> Again, we used the final percent after a follow-up question to confirm the meaning of “roadside safety checks.”

percentage in north/central Illinois (6% to 7% to 9%) and particularly in the City of Chicago (3% to 4% to 12%).

### ***Drinking-related roadside check questions (later in the interview)***

**Awareness of “DUI” roadside safety checks.** The percent who indicated that, “*in the past thirty days,*” they had “*seen or heard anything about the police setting up roadside safety checks that were used primarily to check for alcohol impaired driving,*” was stable, at nearly 30 percent in both the June and July surveys (28% and 30%), and then increased by about 10 percentage points in the January survey (40%). The results are about the same for those respondents who indicated drinking alcohol in the past thirty days.

In north/central Illinois, there are consecutive increases in this awareness (27% to 34% to 47%). In both the Chicago suburbs (27% and 28% to 39%) and southern Illinois (29% and 31% to 38%), there is an increase from the two 2003 surveys to the January survey. For the City of Chicago, the January result is just slightly more than the June result after a decline in July (33% to 26% to 36%).

*Of those who had seen/heard of such roadside checks,* those who indicated “*having personally gone through [these] checks*” increased only slightly is quite stable (12%, 14%, and 14%). The same basically holds for those who reported drinking in the past thirty days (11%, 14%, and 12%).

This amounts to about 4 percent of all sample members in both the June and July surveys and nearly 6 percent of the January surveys. This translates into percentages in the range of 3 percent to 5 percent for all regions but north/central Illinois, where the range is 4 percent to 8 percent. In all cases, the largest percent was found in the January 2004 survey.

### **Messages about alcohol-impaired driving**

**Awareness of messages about alcohol-impaired driving.** The percent who indicated that, “*in the past thirty days,*” they had “*read, seen or heard anything about alcohol impaired driving in Illinois,*” remained stable at 62 percent in the June and July surveys, and then increased substantially to more than three-quarters (77%) in January. The results are quite similar for those respondents who reported drinking an alcoholic beverage in the past thirty days.

In both of the Chicago area regions, the June to July awareness level is quite stable, and then a large increase occurred from July to January (for City of Chicago, 59% and 62% to 77%; for the Chicago suburbs, 58% and 64% to 76%). In both of the downstate regions, the trend is a decline in awareness from June to July and then an increase to a level in January much higher than that which existed in June (for north/central Illinois, 70% to 64% to 78%; for southern Illinois, 63% to 54% to 74%). Note that in January 2004, the awareness level across the four regions ranged only from a low of 74 percent to a high of 78 percent.

**Sources of messages.** *Of those who had seen or heard such messages,* by far the greatest exposure source is found for television (78%, 75%, and 78% across the three surveys). In January 2004, this is followed that of: billboards / bus signs (48%, 40%, and 50%) and then newspapers (50%, 56%, and 48%). In turn, these are followed in January by radio (38%, 38%, and 44%) and posters / bumper stickers (33%, 38%, and 42%). A stable approximate one-quarter said they had heard about this from friends/relatives (24%, 23%, and 26%), and about

one in seven said from brochures or pamphlets (15%, 14%, and 13%). In January, the results for those who have had a drink in the past thirty days are very similar.

The following presents results by region and based on those who are aware of any messages.

For television, exposure is high across all four regions in January 2004 (86% in the City of Chicago; 81% in southern Illinois; 78% in the Chicago suburbs; and 70% in north/central Illinois). A general stability in this awareness is found in both the Chicago suburbs and in north/central Illinois. An increase from the June to both the July and January surveys is found in the City of Chicago. And, southern Illinois shows a low-point in awareness for the July survey.

For radio, exposure is at or just over 50 percent for the City of Chicago (56%) and southern Illinois (51%) while being about 40 percent in the Chicago suburbs (40%) and north/central Illinois (38%). For both the City of Chicago and southern Illinois, the largest increase occurred between the July and January surveys; for north/central Illinois, this occurred between the June and July surveys. Exposure is more stable in the Chicago suburbs.

For newspapers, exposure is about 46 percent in the two Chicago area regions, 51 percent in north/central Illinois, 57 percent in southern Illinois. The trend for three of the regions is for the July exposure percentage to be higher than either the June or January percentage, which in turn are very similar. The trend in the City of Chicago is just the opposite.

For billboards or bus signs, the exposure percentage is at or just over 50 percent in both north/central Illinois (57%) and in the City of Chicago (51%). It is just under 50 percent for the other two regions (46%-47%). For three of the regions, the trend is for the July percentage to be lower than either the June or January percentage, which in turn are quite similar. For north/central Illinois, there are consecutive increases in this percentage.

For posters or bumper stickers, the largest exposure percentage is found in north/central Illinois at almost one-half (47%). This is about four in ten for southern Illinois (42%) and the Chicago suburbs (40%) and just under this for the City of Chicago (37%). Consecutive increases in this percentage are found in north/central Illinois (27% to 40% to 47%). The July percentage is the lowpoint for southern Illinois respondents. And, general stability is found for this percentage in the two Chicago regions.

For brochures or pamphlets, the exposure percentage is 16 percent for the City of Chicago and 11 to 13 percent in the other three regions. Small decreases are found from July to January for both the Chicago suburbs and southern Illinois.

For friends or relatives, all four regions show an exposure percentage of about one-quarter (24%-27%). Overall, a great deal of consistency is found in these percentages across the three surveys, ranging from about one-in-five to about one-in-four (with the exception of southern Illinois for July, with 16%).

Respondents who said they were exposed through television, radio, or newspapers were asked whether this was through a commercial/advertisement, through a news program or story, or something else. The results show that television-exposure is divided about equal between advertisements and news stories, radio exposure is tilted toward advertisements, and newspaper exposure is primarily through news stories.

**Reported trend in number of messages.** *Those who said they were exposed to messages about alcohol impaired driving (just over three-quarters of the January respondents and about six of ten in the earlier surveys) were asked whether "the number of messages that [they] have seen or heard about alcohol impaired driving in the past thirty days is more than usual, fewer than usual, or about the same as usual."* The statewide percent of these

respondents choosing “more than usual” increased by one-third, from 21 percent in the June to 30 percent in July, and then increased modestly to 35 percent in January. This increase is a bit greater for those respondents who reported drinking alcohol in the past thirty days, nearly doubling in size from June 2003 to January 2004 (18% to 31% to 37%).

In all four regions, the percent who said “more than usual” has increased across each of the three surveys. The total increases from June to January for the four regions are: City of Chicago (+17% pts.); Chicago suburbs (+15% pts.); southern Illinois (+14% pts.); and north/central Illinois (+10% pts.). In the two Chicago area regions, most of this change occurred from June to July, while in southern Illinois most of this change occurred from July to January. The change is more equal in the two time intervals for north/central Illinois.

## Awareness of selected traffic safety slogans

Respondents were asked about their awareness of selected traffic safety “slogans,” 15 in the June pre-test survey and 18 in the July post-test survey and in the January 2004 survey. Eight of the June slogans were related to drinking and driving, while ten of the July and January slogans clearly were related as well.

The following Table S-1 presents the results, ordered by the sizes of the difference in awareness from the July 2003 to the January 2004 surveys. The table also presents the June to July differences. Slogans clearly related to DUI are in bold, with two particularly noted in non-italic bold, “**You drink, you drive, you lose**” and “**Drive hammered, get nailed.**” The latter slogan was the focus of the 2003 July 4<sup>th</sup> campaign while the former slogan was the focus of the recent end-of-year holiday campaign.<sup>13</sup>

An examination of the most recent July to January differences shows only one slogan with a substantial increase in awareness, *that of* “*You drink, you drive, you lose*” (+16%). An earlier 7 percentage point from June to July accompanies the most recent gain, for a total gain of 23 percentage points from June to January. The result was an awareness level of 78 percent for this slogan in January 2004.

In the earlier June to July differences, again only one slogan showed a substantial increase in awareness, this time *that of* “*Drive hammered, get nailed*” (+22%). This is accompanied by a more recent modest decline in awareness of the slogan from July to January, for a total net gain in awareness from June to January of 17 percentage points. Here, the result was a 46 percent awareness level in January.

While differences for other slogans pale in significance to the above, comments on a few other DUI-related slogans are worth noting:

- The slogan “*Friends don’t let friends drive drunk*” is one of the two most familiar slogans across each of the three surveys, with an awareness of nearly 90 percent, along with the seat belt “Click It or Ticket” slogan.
- A consistent two-thirds of the respondents are aware of the slogan, “*Drive smart, drive sober.*”
- The slogan, “*Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers,*” shows an increase of 6 percentage points, from 48% to 54% across the three surveys.

---

<sup>13</sup> The recent variant of this slogan is “You drink and drive, you lose.” The January 2004 survey kept the wording of the slogan in the earlier surveys.

- The other part of this one-time combined slogan, “*Wanna drink and drive? Police in Illinois will show you the bars,*” also shows an increase of 6 percentage points at a lower awareness level, with the increase all concentrated between June and July (24% to 30%).
- About one-fifth to one-quarter across the three surveys are aware of the slogan, “*Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number*” (22%, 24%, and 26%).

**Table S-1**  
**Awareness of Selected Traffic Safety Slogans, 2003 and 2004**

<i>Slogans</i>	<i>June Pre- test</i>	<i>July Post- test</i>	<i>June to July diff.*</i>	<i>Jan. 2004</i>	<i>July to Jan. diff.*</i>
<b>You drink, you drive, you lose .....</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>+7%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>+16%</b>
Click It or Ticket .....	85%	83%	-2%	87%	+4%
<b>Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers** / ...</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>+2%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>+3%</b>
<b>--Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois</b>					
<b>will show you the bars .....</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>+6%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>+0%</b>
<b>Drive smart, drive sober .....</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>+3%</b>
<b>Drink and drive? Police in Illinois</b>					
<b>have your number .....</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>+2%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>+2%</b>
<b>Team DUI .....</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>+2%</b>
Children in back .....	24%	25%	+1%	24%	-1%
Help promote wreck-less driving.					
Don't hang out in the no zone .....	9%	10%	+1%	10%	-1%
Operation A-B-C .....	5%	6%	+1%	6%	-1%
Stupid driving tricks .....	7%	7%	+0%	6%	-1%
Checkpoint strikeforce .....	na	9%	na	8%	-1%
Buckle up America .....	53%	55%	+2%	53%	-2%
<b>Step away from your vehicle .....</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>-2%</b>
<b>Friends don't let friends drive drunk .....</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>-0%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>-2%</b>
<b>Cell phones save lives. Pull over and</b>					
<b>report a drunk driver .....</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>-2%</b>
Smart motorists always respect trucks .....	11%	12%	+1%	9%	-3%
<b>Drive hammered, get nailed .....</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>+22%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>-5%</b>

\*Differences are based on actual differences, not the rounded integer results presented.

\*\*In surveys prior to the June 2003 survey, this and the following slogan were presented as one slogan. In subsequent surveys, it was split into two parts.

**Focusing on the major slogan in the 2003 end-of-year holiday initiative, “You drink, you drive, you lose,” for our regional analysis,** the January 2004 survey results show awareness levels of 80 percent or more for both the City of Chicago (83%) and southern Illinois (81%). Awareness is only a bit less, at around three-quarters, for both north/central Illinois (76%) and the Chicago suburbs (75%). In every region, this slogan was ranked third in the order of

awareness (behind “Click It or Ticket” and “Friends don’t let friends drive drunk”). Table S-2 below presents the statewide and regional results for this slogan for these three surveys as well as the changes for each time interval.

**Table S-2**  
**Awareness of Major DUI Slogan of 2003 End-of-Year Campaign,**  
**“You drink, you drive, you lose”\***

<i>Region</i>	<i>June Pre- test</i>	<i>July Post- test</i>	<i>June to July diff.*</i>	<i>Jan 2004</i>	<i>July to Jan. diff.*</i>	<i>Total. Diff.</i>
<b>STATEWIDE .....</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>+7%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>+16%</b>	<b>+23%</b>
City of Chicago .....	47%	58%	+10%	83%	+26%	+36%
Chicago suburbs .....	55%	58%	+3%	75%	+17%	+20%
North/central Illinois .....	58%	68%	+10%	76%	+8%	+18%
Southern Illinois .....	70%	71%	+1%	81%	+10%	+10%

**The 2002 through 2004 trends.** Because there were media/enforcement campaigns in calendar year 2002 for which we have pre-test and post-test information for numerous selected traffic safety slogans, it is worth presenting the full cross-sectional trend results. These are presented in Table S-3, according to level of awareness in the January 2004 survey.

The results suggest the magnitude of the impacts of the recent campaigns for particular traffic safety slogans. Generally, it is found that those slogans selected for emphasis in a particular campaign show the largest increases in awareness. Those that do not either decline in awareness or remain stable.

**Table S-3**  
**Awareness of Selected Traffic Safety Slogans,**  
**April 2002 through January 2004**

<b>Slogan</b>	<b>April 2002 Pre-test</b>	<b>June 2002 Post-test</b>	<b>Nov 2002 Pre-test</b>	<b>Dec 2002 Post-test</b>	<b>May 2003 Pre-test</b>	<b>June 2003 Survey</b>	<b>July 2003 Post-test</b>	<b>January 2004</b>
Click It or Ticket	41%	71%	67%	71%	67%	85%	83%	87%
Friends don't let friends drive drunk	na	na	na	na	na	89%	89%	86%
You drink, you drive, you lose	na	na	na	na	na	55%	62%	78%
Drive smart, drive sober	61%	62%	58%	62%	65%	67%	66%	68%
Police in Illinois arrest drunk drivers*	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	48%	50%	54%
Buckle Up America	60%	60%	53%	54%	48%	53%	55%	53%
Drive hammered, get nailed	na	na	na	na	na	30%	52%	46%
Cell phones save lives. Pull over and report a drunk driver.	36%	41%	45%	44%	39%	46%	42%	40%
Wanna drink and drive, police in Illinois will show you the bars*	40%	39%	33%	36%	29%	24%	30%	30%
Drink and drive? Police in Illinois have your number	na	na	na	na	na	22%	24%	26%
Children in back	20%	25%	19%	21%	22%	24%	25%	24%
Step away from your vehicle	na	na	na	na	na	na	16%	13%
Team DUI	na	na	na	na	na	na	10%	11%
Help promote wreck-less driving. Don't hang out in the no zone	9%	12%	8%	8%	10%	9%	10%	10%
Smart motorists always respect trucks	6%	12%	8%	11%	11%	11%	12%	9%
Checkpoint strikeforce	na	na	na	na	na	na	9%	8%
Stupid driving tricks	6%	6%	5%	6%	5%	7%	7%	6%
Operation A-B-C	4%	6%	4%	6%	7%	5%	6%	6%

\*Prior to the June 2003 survey, this was one slogan.